REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 have been amended and claims 13-15 have been added, leaving claims 1-3 and 6-15 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Support for the amendments can be found on page 5, line 22 to page 6, line 18. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks submitted herewith.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hirano et al. (US 6,292,241) ("Hirano"). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shintani et al. (US 5,978,056) ("Shintani"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 8 includes the following limitation: "a step of forming a back-surface electrode layer, a thickness of said back-surface electrode layer is such that no substantial protrusion is formed in said display electrode." There is nothing in Hirano or Shintani that disclose such a limitation. Accordingly, Hirano and Shintani do not anticipate claim 8. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada et al. (U.S. 5,182,620) ("Shimada '620") in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. 5,877,832) ("Shimada '832"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

The Examiner has combined Shimada '620 and Shimada '832 and asserts that those two references teach all of the claimed limitations. Claims 1, 6, and 12, as amended, include the following limitations: "a thickness of said back-surface electrode is such that no

substantial protrusion is formed in said display electrode." Shimada '620 and Shimada '832 do not teach or suggest this limitation.

There is no teaching in either of the Shimada references that the thickness of the back-surface electrode is such that no substantial protrusion is formed in the display electrode. In Shimada '620, there is no back-surface electrode and thus, there can be no teaching of a thickness of a back-surface electrode. In addition, there is nothing in Shimada '832 that even discusses the possibility of protrusions in the reflective electrode 40 or having a thickness of the back-surface electrode such that no substantially protrusion is formed in the reflective electrode 40. In fact, Shimada '832 teaches that the reflective electrode 40 is actually formed in a wave pattern. Shimada '832 teaches that this wave pattern is important in that it efficiently reflects light incident from outside. See column 11, lines 24-32. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada '620 in view of Shimada '832, as applied to claims 1 and 6, and further in view of Hirano. First, claims 2, 3, and 7 include all of the limitations of claim 1. As explained above Shimada '620 and Shimada '832 do not teach all of the limitations of claims 1 and 6. Hirano does not remedy the deficiency.

Second, although the Examiner recognizes that ITO is not a high melting point metal, the Examiner bases the rejection on the determination that ITO has a high melting point. The Examiner reasons that, because ITO has a high melting point, forming the back-surface electrode using a high melting point metal is obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree with this reasoning. It is not obvious to use a high melting point metal just because Shimada uses an ITO, which just happens to have a high melting point. An ITO is in oxide. There is absolutely no teaching in any of the references that use of a high melting point metal is desirable. Thus, claims 2, 3, and 7 are allowable claims for this additional reason. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections as to those claims be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintani, as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Ishii et al. (US 5,566,010). Claim 9 includes all of the limitations of claim 8. Neither Shintani nor Ishii disclose the following limitation: "a step of forming a back-surface electrode layer, a thickness of said back-surface electrode layer is such that no substantial protrusion is formed in said display electrode." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants have also added new claims 13-15. As these claims depend from allowable claims, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow those claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____

Lisa A. Bongiovi
Registration No. 48,933
Confirmation No. 9014
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

June 3, 2003